

# On $\ell_1$ -regularized estimation for nonlinear models that have sparse underlying linear structures

Zhiyi Chi<sup>1</sup>

Department of Statistics  
University of Connecticut

November 25, 2009

## Abstract

In [4], for nonlinear models with sparse underlying linear structures, we studied the error bounds of  $\ell_0$ -regularized estimation. In this note, we show that  $\ell_1$ -regularized estimation in some important cases can achieve the same order of error bounds as those in [4].

*Keywords and phrases.* Regularization, sparsity, MLE, regression, variable selection, parameter estimation, nonlinearity, power series expansion, analytic, exponential.

*AMS 2000 subject classification.* Primary 62G05; secondary 62J02.

*Acknowledgement.* Research partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-07-06048 and NIH Grant MH-68028.

## 1 Introduction

The models we consider are of the form

$$y = f(X^\top \beta) + \epsilon, \quad X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \quad y, \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a *known* function,  $X$  a fixed design matrix,  $y$  and  $\epsilon$  are vectors of observations and errors, respectively. In (1.1) and henceforth, for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we denote  $f(x) = (f(x_1), \dots, f(x_n))^\top$ . The parameter  $\beta$  is sparse in the sense that the number of its nonzero coordinates is much smaller than its dimension [9].

For  $a > 0$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , denote by  $\|v\|_a$  the  $\ell_a$ -norm of  $v$ . The support of  $v$  is defined to be  $\text{spt}(v) := \{i : v_i \neq 0\}$ . Denote by  $|A|$  the cardinality of a set  $A$ . The  $\ell_0$ -norm of  $v$  is  $\|v\|_0 = |\text{spt}(v)|$ . By an  $\ell_a$ -regularized estimator of  $\beta$  we mean

$$\hat{\beta} = \arg \min_{v \in D} [\ell(y, Xv) + c_r \|v\|_a], \quad (1.2)$$

where  $D \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  is a pre-selected search domain,  $\ell(y, Xv)$  a loss function, and  $c_r > 0$  a tuning parameter. We are interested in the case where  $a = 1$ .

For models (1.1), much has been learned about the case where  $p$  is fixed or much smaller than  $n$  (cf. [5; 6] and references therein). The note is concerned with the case where  $p$  can be large, possibly much larger than  $n$  and, at the same time,  $|\text{spt}(\beta)|$

---

<sup>1</sup>Address: 215 Glenbrook Road, U-4120, Storrs, CT 06269, USA

is much smaller than  $p$ . Under this setting, the case where  $f(x) = x$  has been a subject of great interest recently (cf. [1; 2; 3; 8; 10; 11] and references therein).

The main purpose of the note is to establish general results on the estimator (1.2) similar to Proposition 2.1 in [4]. Once established, the results allow the steps in [4] to be followed, often word by word, to get error bounds for specific cases. In (1.2), while the function being maximized only involves  $\|v\|_1$ , the search domain  $D$  may be constrained in terms of  $\|v\|_0$  as well as certain weighted  $\ell_1$ -norm of  $v$ . As a result, we get two types of estimators, one being regularized by  $\|v\|_0$  and (weighted)  $\ell_1$ -norms of  $v$ , the other only by  $\ell_1$ -norms of  $v$ . Error bounds for both types of estimators will be derived. The former type of estimators can attain the same order of precision as their  $\ell_0$ -regularized counterparts studied in [4]. In contrast, although the latter type of estimators are computationally more amenable, in some cases they seem unable to attain the same order of precision, at least with the techniques employed here.

To reduce repetition, we will omit most of results that can be established directly following [4] and instead focus on those that require new ideas.

## 2 Main results

The row vectors and column vectors of  $X$  will be denoted by  $X_1^\top, \dots, X_n^\top$  and  $V_1, \dots, V_p$ , respectively. We shall assume that  $V_j \neq 0$ . For  $g = (g_1, \dots, g_n)$  and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , where each  $g_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a function, denote  $g(x) = (g_1(x_1), \dots, g_n(x_n))^\top$ .

As in [4], to bound the error of the  $\ell_1$ -regularized estimator in (1.2), our first step is to show that  $\hat{\beta}$  belongs to a set of  $v$  that satisfy the following inequality,

$$G(\psi(Xv) - \psi(X\beta)) \leq 2|\langle \epsilon, \varphi(Xv) - \varphi(X\beta) \rangle| - c_r(\|v\|_1 - \|\beta\|_1), \quad (2.1)$$

where  $G : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a function,  $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_n)$ ,  $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_n)$ , with  $\psi_i$  and  $\varphi_i$  being functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . In many cases, it is not very hard to get (2.1) for maximum likelihood estimators (MLE) or least square estimators (LSE). We will illustrate this later. Our focus next is to use (2.1) to derive two error bounds for  $\hat{\beta}$ .

### 2.1 Conditions and general error bounds

For both error bounds, we need the following condition.

**Condition H1** Given  $q \in (0, 1)$ , there is  $c_1 = c_1(X, \beta, \varphi, q) > 0$ , such that

$$\Pr \{ |\langle \epsilon, \varphi(Xv) - \varphi(X\beta) \rangle| \leq c_1 \sqrt{n} \|v - \beta\|_1, \text{ all } v \in D \} \geq 1 - c_0 q,$$

where  $c_0 > 0$  is an arbitrarily pre-selected constant, such as 1 or 2.

The same condition was used in [4], but with  $c_0 = 2$ . As remarked in [4],  $c_0$  is purely for notational ease when Condition H1 is verified for specific cases. To get the first bound, we also need another condition used in [4].

**Condition H2** There is  $c_2 = c_2(X, \beta, \psi) > 0$ , such that for all  $v \in D$ ,

$$G(\psi(Xv) - \psi(X\beta)) \geq c_2 n \|v - \beta\|_2^2.$$

We now can state the first error bound for  $\hat{\beta}$ .

**Proposition 2.1** Suppose Conditions **H1** and **H2** are satisfied. If  $\hat{\beta} \in D$  is a random variable that always satisfies the inequality (2.1) with  $c_r = 2c_1\sqrt{n}$ , then, letting  $\kappa_r = 4c_1/c_2$ ,  $\Pr\{\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2 \leq \kappa_r \sqrt{|\text{spt}(\beta)|/n}\} \geq 1 - c_0 q$ .

To get the second bound, we replace Condition **H2** with the next one.

**Condition H3** There is  $c_3 = c_3(X, \beta, \psi) > 0$ , such that for all  $z \in \{Xv : v \in D\}$ ,

$$G(\psi(z) - \psi(X\beta)) \geq c_3 \|z - X\beta\|_2^2.$$

We also need some conditions on the second moments of the column vectors of  $X$ . Such conditions are sometimes referred to as coherence property [1; 2]. Let

$$\mu_X = \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq p} \frac{|V_i^\top V_j|}{\|V_i\|_2 \|V_j\|_2}, \quad a_X = \min_{1 \leq i \leq p} \frac{\|V_i\|_2^2}{n}, \quad b_X = \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} \frac{\|V_i\|_2^2}{n}.$$

**Proposition 2.2** Suppose Conditions **H1** and **H3** are satisfied and  $a_X + b_X \mu_X > 6b_X |\text{spt}(\beta)| \mu_X$ . Fix  $\tau > 0$  such that

$$a_X + b_X \mu_X > 2b_X (3 + 4\tau) |\text{spt}(\beta)| \mu_X, \quad (2.2)$$

and let  $c_r = 2(1 + 1/\tau)c_1\sqrt{n}$ ,

$$\kappa_r = \frac{3(2 + 1/\tau)\sqrt{2 + (1 + 2\tau)^2}}{a_X + b_X \mu_X} \times \frac{c_1}{c_3}.$$

If  $\hat{\beta} \in D$  is a random variable that always satisfies the inequality (2.1) with the above  $c_r$  as the tuning parameter, then  $\Pr\{\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2 \leq \kappa_r \sqrt{|\text{spt}(\beta)|/n}\} \geq 1 - c_0 q$ .

Since  $a_X \leq b_X$ , (2.2) sets an upper bound on  $\mu_X$ . To get a moderate value of  $\kappa_r$  in Proposition 2.2,  $\tau$  has to be moderate. If, say,  $\tau = 1$ , then by (2.2),  $a_X/b_X > (14|\text{spt}(\beta)| - 1)\mu_X$ , which further limits the magnitude of  $\mu_X$ . Under certain conditions, one can get  $\mu_X = O(\sqrt{n^{-1} \ln p})$  [2; 4], which is small for large  $n$ , even when  $p$  is much larger than  $n$ , for example,  $p = n^\alpha$  with some  $\alpha > 1$ .

We next make some comments on conditions used in specific cases to establish Conditions **H1** – **H3**. To establish Condition **H1**, the following tail condition on the errors  $\epsilon_i$  is useful: there are  $\sigma > 0$  and  $c_\epsilon \geq 1$ , such that

$$\Pr\{|a^\top \epsilon| > t \|a\|_2\} \leq c_\epsilon e^{-t^2/(2\sigma^2)}, \quad \text{all } t \geq 0, a \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (2.3)$$

As remarked in [4], typically  $c_\epsilon$  can be set at 2. At the end of the note, we will see that in some cases  $c_\epsilon$  has to be set at other values.

To establish Condition **H2** or **H3**, we usually need to put some restrictions on the search domain  $D$  in (1.2). To establish Condition **H3**, which is the less restrictive of the two, we typically choose

$$D \subseteq \mathcal{D}(I) = T^{-1}(I^n) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^p : X_i^\top v \in I, 1 \leq i \leq n\}, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $T$  is the mapping  $v \rightarrow Xv$  and  $I$  is an interval in  $\mathbb{R}$ . In general, we need not put restrictions on  $|\text{spt}(v)|$ . On the other hand, to establish Condition **H2**, we typically start with verifying Condition **H3**, and then proceed to get  $\|X(v - \beta)\|_2 \geq c\|v - \beta\|_2$  for some constant  $c > 0$ . To do this, we need to put restrictions on  $|\text{spt}(v)|$ , typically by requiring

$$D \subseteq \mathcal{D}(I, h) = \mathcal{D}(I) \cap \{u \in \mathbb{R}^p : |\text{spt}(u)| \leq h\},$$

with  $h \geq 1$  being bounded in terms of  $\mu_X$  (cf. [4]). Thus, though not directly used in Proposition 2.1, coherence property of  $X$  is needed in specific applications of the Proposition.

## 2.2 Proofs

For  $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$  and  $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ , denote  $v_S = (x_1, \dots, x_p)^T$  with  $x_i = v_i \mathbf{1}\{i \in S\}$ . Let  $d = v - \beta$ . Then for any  $S \supset \text{spt}(\beta)$ , we have  $v = \beta + d_S + v_{S^c}$  and

$$\|v\|_1 = \|\beta + d_S\|_1 + \|v_{S^c}\|_1, \quad \|d\|_a^a = \|d_S\|_a^a + \|v_{S^c}\|_a^a, \quad \text{for any } a > 0. \quad (2.5)$$

*Proof of Proposition 2.1.* Let  $d = \hat{\beta} - \beta$ . Because  $\hat{\beta}$  always satisfies (2.1), by Conditions **H1** and **H2**, with probability at least  $1 - c_0 q$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 n \|d\|_2^2 &\leq 2c_1 \sqrt{n} \|d\|_1 - c_r (\|\hat{\beta}\|_1 - \|\beta\|_1) \\ &= 2c_1 \sqrt{n} (\|d\|_1 + \|\beta\|_1 - \|\hat{\beta}\|_1). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $S = \text{spt}(\beta)$ . Apply (2.5) to the right hand side of the above inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 n \|d\|_2^2 &\leq 2c_1 \sqrt{n} (\|d_S\|_1 + \|\hat{\beta}_{S^c}\|_1 + \|\beta\|_1 - \|\beta + d_S\|_1 - \|\hat{\beta}_{S^c}\|_1) \\ &= 2c_1 \sqrt{n} (\|d_S\|_1 + \|\beta\|_1 - \|\beta + d_S\|_1). \end{aligned}$$

Then by Minkowski inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\|d\|_2^2 \leq 4(c_1/c_2) \|d_S\|_1 / \sqrt{n} \leq \kappa_r \sqrt{|S|/n} \|d_S\|_2.$$

Because  $\|d\|_2^2 = \|d_S\|_2^2 + \|\hat{\beta}_{S^c}\|_2^2$  by (2.5), the above inequalities imply

$$\|d\|_2^2 \leq M := \sup\{x^2 + y^2 : x \geq 0 \text{ and } y \geq 0 \text{ satisfy } x^2 + y^2 \leq \kappa_r \sqrt{|S|/n} x\}.$$

To find  $M$ , first, in order that  $x^2 + y^2 \leq \kappa_r \sqrt{|S|/n} x$ , there must be  $\kappa_r^2 |S|/n \geq 4y^2$ . Given  $y \geq 0$  satisfying the condition, the maximum possible  $x$  is

$$x_0(y) = (1/2)[\kappa_r \sqrt{|S|/n} + \sqrt{\kappa_r^2 |S|/n - 4y^2}].$$

It is seen that

$$x_0^2(y) + y^2 = \frac{\kappa_r^2 |S|/n + \kappa_r \sqrt{|S|/n} \sqrt{\kappa_r^2 |S|/n - 4y^2}}{2} \leq \kappa_r^2 |S|/n.$$

Therefore,  $M = \kappa_r^2 |S|/n$ , where the maximum is obtained if and only if  $x = \kappa_r \sqrt{|S|/n}$  and  $y = 0$ . This yields  $\|d\|_2 \leq \sqrt{M} = \kappa_r \sqrt{|S|/n}$ , as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.2.* It suffices to show that

$$\Pr \left\{ \|v - \beta\|_2 \leq \kappa_r \sqrt{|\text{spt}(\beta)|/n} \text{ for all } v \in D \text{ satisfying (2.1)} \right\} \geq 1 - c_0 q. \quad (2.6)$$

By Conditions H1 and H3, with probability at least  $1 - c_0 q$ , the inequality

$$c_3 \|X(v - \beta)\|_2^2 \leq 2c_1 \sqrt{n} \|v - \beta\|_1 - 2c_1(1 + 1/\tau) \sqrt{n} (\|v\|_1 - \|\beta\|_1)$$

holds for all  $v \in D$  satisfying (2.1). Fix one such  $v$  and an arbitrary  $S \supset \text{spt}(\beta)$ . Let  $d = v - \beta$ . By (2.5),

$$\begin{aligned} c_3 \|Xd\|_2^2 &\leq 2c_1 \sqrt{n} (\|d_S\|_1 + \|v_{S^c}\|_1) \\ &\quad - 2c_1(1 + 1/\tau) \sqrt{n} (\|\beta + d_S\|_1 + \|v_{S^c}\|_1 - \|\beta\|_1) \\ &= 2c_1 \sqrt{n} \|d_S\|_1 - 2c_1(1 + 1/\tau) \sqrt{n} (\|\beta + d_S\|_1 - \|\beta\|_1) - 2(c_1/\tau) \sqrt{n} \|v_{S^c}\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

For ease of notation, denote  $\tilde{c}_1 = c_1/c_3$  for now. By Minkowski inequality,  $\|\beta + d_S\|_1 - \|\beta\|_1 \geq -\|d_S\|_1$ , and so

$$\|Xd\|_2^2 \leq 2\tilde{c}_1(2 + 1/\tau) \sqrt{n} \|d_S\|_1 - (2\tilde{c}_1/\tau) \sqrt{n} \|v_{S^c}\|_1. \quad (2.7)$$

First of all, since the left hand side of (2.7) is nonnegative, it follows that

$$\|v_{S^c}\|_1 \leq (1 + 2\tau) \|d_S\|_1. \quad (2.8)$$

On the other hand, by  $Xd = Xd_S + Xv_{S^c}$ ,

$$\|Xd\|_2^2 = \|Xd_S\|_2^2 + \|Xv_{S^c}\|_2^2 + 2 \langle Xd_S, Xv_{S^c} \rangle \geq \|Xd_S\|_2^2 - 2 |\langle Xd_S, Xv_{S^c} \rangle|.$$

We next derive a lower bound of  $\|Xd\|_2^2$ . First, by  $Xd_S = \sum_{i \in S} d_i V_i$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Xd_S\|_2^2 &= \sum_{i \in S} d_i^2 \|V_i\|_2^2 + \sum_{i, j \in S, i \neq j} d_i d_j (V_i^\top V_j) \\ &\geq \sum_{i \in S} d_i^2 \|V_i\|_2^2 - \sum_{i, j \in S, i \neq j} |d_i d_j| |V_i^\top V_j|. \end{aligned}$$

Because  $\|V_i\|_2^2 \geq a_X$  and for  $i \neq j$ ,  $|V_i^\top V_j| \leq \mu_X \|V_i\|_2 \|V_j\|_2 \leq b_X \mu_X n$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|Xd_S\|_2^2 &\geq a_X n \sum_{i \in S} d_i^2 - b_X \mu_X n \sum_{i, j \in S, i \neq j} |d_i d_j| \\ &= (a_X + b_X \mu_X) n \|d_S\|_2^2 - b_X \mu_X n \|d_S\|_1^2. \end{aligned}$$

Second, by  $Xv_{S^c} = \sum_{j \notin S} v_j V_j$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle Xd_S, Xv_{S^c} \rangle| &= \left| \sum_{i \in S, j \notin S} d_i v_j V_i^\top V_j \right| \leq \sum_{i \in S, j \notin S} |d_i v_j| |V_i^\top V_j| \\ &\leq b_X \mu_X n \sum_{i \in S, j \notin S} |d_i v_j| = b_X \mu_X n \|d_S\|_1 \|v_{S^c}\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, putting the above inequalities together,

$$\|Xd\|_2^2 \geq (a_X + b_X \mu_X) n \|d_S\|_2^2 - b_X \mu_X n \|d_S\|_1^2 - 2b_X \mu_X n \|d_S\|_1 \|v_{S^c}\|_1. \quad (2.9)$$

Combining (2.7) and (2.9), and then grouping the terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned} (a_X + b_X \mu_X) n \|d_S\|_2^2 &\leq b_X \mu_X n \|d_S\|_1^2 + 2\tilde{c}_1(2 + 1/\tau)\sqrt{n}\|d_S\|_1 \\ &\quad + 2\{b_X \mu_X \sqrt{n}\|d_S\|_1 - \tilde{c}_1/\tau\} \sqrt{n}\|v_{S^c}\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

So far, other than the requirement that  $S \supset \text{spt}(\beta)$ , the choice of  $S$  is arbitrary. To continue, we need the next result that puts more constraints on  $S$ .

**Lemma 2.3** *Suppose  $S \supset \text{spt}(\beta)$  such that  $a_X + b_X \mu_X > b_X \mu_X(3 + 4\tau)|S|$ . Then  $b_X \mu_X \sqrt{n}\|d_S\|_1 < \tilde{c}_1/\tau$ .*

Assume the lemma is true for now. Let  $S \supset \text{spt}(\beta)$  such that  $a_X + b_X \mu_X > b_X \mu_X(3 + 4\tau)|S|$ . Later we will see that such  $S$  indeed exists and make specific choices for it. By (2.10), Lemma 2.3, and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} (a_X + b_X \mu_X) n \|d_S\|_2^2 &\leq b_X \mu_X n \|d_S\|_1^2 + 2\tilde{c}_1(2 + 1/\tau)\sqrt{n}\|d_S\|_1 \\ &\leq b_X \mu_X n |S| \|d_S\|_2^2 + 2\tilde{c}_1(2 + 1/\tau)\sqrt{n|S|} \|d_S\|_2 \\ &\leq (a_X + b_X \mu_X) n \|d_S\|_2^2 / 3 + 2\tilde{c}_1(2 + 1/\tau)\sqrt{n|S|} \|d_S\|_2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to  $a_X + b_X \mu_X > 3b_X \mu_X |S|$ . Thus

$$\|d_S\|_2 \leq \frac{3\tilde{c}_1(2 + 1/\tau)\sqrt{|S|}}{(a_X + b_X \mu_X)\sqrt{n}}. \quad (2.11)$$

Let  $S_1$  be the union of  $\text{spt}(\beta)$  and the set of  $i \notin \text{spt}(\beta)$  with the  $|\text{spt}(\beta)|$  largest  $d_i$  outside  $\text{spt}(\beta)$ . By Lemma 3.1 of [3],

$$\|d\|_2^2 \leq \|d_{S_1}\|_2^2 + \frac{\|d_{\text{spt}(\beta)^c}\|_1^2}{|\text{spt}(\beta)|}. \quad (2.12)$$

Since  $d_{\text{spt}(\beta)^c} = v_{\text{spt}(\beta)^c}$ , by (2.8) and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$\|d_{\text{spt}(\beta)^c}\|_1 \leq (1 + 2\tau)\|d_{\text{spt}(\beta)}\|_1 \leq (1 + 2\tau)\sqrt{|\text{spt}(\beta)|}\|d_{\text{spt}(\beta)}\|_2,$$

which together with (2.12) yields

$$\|d\|_2^2 \leq \|d_{S_1}\|_2^2 + (1 + 2\tau)^2 \|d_{\text{spt}(\beta)}\|_2^2. \quad (2.13)$$

Note  $|S_1| = 2|\text{spt}(\beta)|$ . By the assumption in (2.2) and Lemma 2.3, it is seen that (2.11) holds for  $S = S_1$  and for  $S = \text{spt}(\beta)$ . Combine this with (2.13) to get

$$\|d\|_2 \leq \frac{3c_1(2 + 1/\tau)\sqrt{[2 + (1 + 2\tau)^2]|\text{spt}(\beta)|}}{c_3(a_X + b_X\mu_X)\sqrt{n}},$$

where we have recovered  $\tilde{c}_1 = c_1/c_3$ . The proof of (2.6) is then complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2.3.* Assume the opposite were true, i.e.  $b_X\mu_X\sqrt{n}\|d_S\|_1 \geq \tilde{c}_1/\tau$ . Then clearly  $d_S \neq 0$ . By (2.8), the right hand side of (2.10) is no greater than

$$\begin{aligned} 2\tilde{c}_1(2 + 1/\tau)\sqrt{n}\|d_S\|_1 + 2\{b_X\mu_X\sqrt{n}\|d_S\|_1 - \tilde{c}_1/\tau\}\sqrt{n}(1 + 2\tau)\|d_S\|_1 \\ = 2b_X\mu_X n(1 + 2\tau)\|d_S\|_1^2, \end{aligned}$$

so (2.10) together with Cauchy-Schwartz inequality yields  $(a_X + b_X\mu_X)\|d_S\|_2^2 \leq b_X\mu_X(3 + 4\tau)\|d_S\|_1^2 \leq b_X\mu_X(3 + 4\tau)|S|\|d_S\|_2^2$ . Since  $d_S \neq 0$ , then  $a_X + b_X\mu_X \leq b_X\mu_X(3 + 4\tau)|S|$ , which contradicts the assumption.  $\square$

### 3 MLE for exponential linear models and LSE for analytic models

In [4], by choosing suitable search domain  $D$ , we derived error bounds for the  $\ell_0$ -regularized MLE and LSE for exponential linear models and analytic models, respectively. Under the conditions in Proposition 2.1, similar error bounds can be derived for the  $\ell_1$ -regularized MLE and LSE, by following almost verbatim the steps in [4]. For brevity, we shall omit the detail. Instead, we shall focus on how to get error bounds under the conditions in Proposition 2.2.

#### 3.1 Exponential linear models

Let  $\{p(x; t) : t \in I\}$  be a family of probability densities with respect to a nonzero Borel measure  $\mu$  on  $\mathbb{R}$ , where  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  is a closed interval, such that

$$p(x; t) = \exp\{ty - \Lambda(t)\}, \text{ with } \Lambda(t) = \ln \left[ \int e^{ty} \mu(dy) \right], \quad t \in I.$$

Suppose  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  are independent, each with density  $p(x; X_i^\top \beta)$ . Let  $D = \mathcal{D}(I)$ , where  $\mathcal{D}(I)$  is defined in (2.4). Assume  $\beta \in D$ , i.e.  $X_i^\top \beta \in I$  for each  $i$ . The  $\ell_1$ -regularized MLE for  $\beta$  is

$$\hat{\beta} = \arg \max_{v \in \mathcal{D}(I)} \left[ y^\top Xv - \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda(X_i^\top v) - c_r \|v\|_1 \right].$$

Let  $\epsilon_i = y_i - \mathbb{E}(y_i) = y_i - \Lambda'(X_i^\top \beta)$ ,  $G(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ ,  $\psi_i(z) = \Lambda(z) - \Lambda'(X_i^\top \beta)z$ , and  $\varphi_i(z) = z/2$ . Then it can be seen that  $\hat{\beta}$  satisfies the inequality (2.1).

Following almost verbatim the proof of Lemma 6.1 in [4], if  $\epsilon$  satisfies the tail condition (2.3), then Condition H1 is satisfied by setting  $c_0 = c_\epsilon$  and

$$c_1 = \sigma \sqrt{\frac{\ln(p/q)}{2n}} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \|V_j\|_2.$$

On the other hand, in [4], it was actually also shown that for each  $v \in \mathcal{D}(I)$ ,  $G(\psi(Xv) - \psi(X\beta)) \geq (1/2) \inf_{t \in I} \Lambda''(t) \times \|X(v - \beta)\|_2^2$ . As a result, we can set

$$c_3 = (1/2) \inf_{t \in I} \Lambda''(t).$$

If  $\inf_{t \in I} \Lambda''(t) > 0$ , then, provided (2.2) in Proposition 2.2 is satisfied,

$$\Pr \left\{ \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2 \leq \frac{3(2 + 1/\tau) \sqrt{2 + (1 + 2\tau)^2}}{a_X + b_X \mu_X} \times \sqrt{2 \ln(p/q)} \times \frac{\sigma \sqrt{|\text{spt}(\beta)|} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \|V_j\|_2}{n \inf_{t \in I} \Lambda''(t)} \right\} \geq 1 - c_\epsilon q.$$

In particular, for the logistic model, where  $\Lambda(t) = \ln(1 + e^t)$ , since  $\epsilon_i = y_i - \Lambda'(X_i^\top \beta)$  with  $y_i = 0$  or  $1$ , we can set  $\sigma = 1/2$  by Hoeffding's inequality [7]. Furthermore, by  $\Lambda''(t) = (2 \cosh(t/2))^{-2}$ ,  $\inf_{t \in I} \Lambda''(t) > 0$  for bounded  $I$ .

### 3.2 Analytic models

Suppose  $y = f(X^\top \beta) + \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)^\top$  has mean 0 and  $f$  is defined on a closed interval  $I \subset \mathbb{R}$  with positive length. Also, suppose  $f$  can be continuously extended into an analytic function on an open domain  $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{C}$  that contains  $I$ . Now let  $D \subseteq \mathcal{D}(I)$  and assume  $\beta \in D$ . The  $\ell_1$ -regularized LSE estimator for  $\beta$  is

$$\hat{\beta} = \arg \min_{v \in D} [\|y - f(Xv)\|_2^2 + c_r \|v\|_1].$$

If we set  $G(x) = \|x\|_2^2$  and  $\psi_i(z) = \varphi_i(z) = f(z)$ , then it can be seen that  $\hat{\beta}$  satisfies (2.1), and for  $v \in I$ ,  $G(\psi(Xv) - \psi(X\beta)) \geq \mathbf{d}(f, I)^2 \|X(v - \beta)\|_2^2$  [4], where

$$\mathbf{d}(f, I) = \inf \left\{ \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{|x - y|} : x \in I, y \in I, x \neq y \right\}.$$

Therefore, if  $\mathbf{d}(f, I) > 0$ , then we can set  $c_3 = \mathbf{d}(f, I)^2$ .

In order to apply Proposition 2.2, we also need to get  $c_1$  for Condition H1. We consider two cases.



In the first case,  $D = \mathcal{D}(I) \cap \{v \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|v\|_{1,\infty} \leq \theta\varrho/2\}$  and is compact, where  $\theta \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\varrho > 0$  such that  $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq \varrho\} \subset \mathcal{N}$ , and

$$\|v\|_{1,\infty} = \sum_{j=1}^p |v_j| \|V_j\|_{\infty}.$$

Let  $\sigma$  be as in the tail condition (2.3). Given  $q \in (0, 1)$ , let  $\lambda_p = \ln[p(1 + q^{-1})]$ . As stated in Proposition 6.5 in [4], we can set

$$c_1 = \sigma \sqrt{2\lambda_p} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{\sqrt{k} |f^{(k)}(0)|}{(k-1)!} (\theta\varrho)^{k-1} \times n^{-\frac{1}{2k}} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \|V_j\|_{2k} \right].$$

Then by Proposition 2.2, we get an error bound of the same order as the  $\ell_0$ -regularized estimator in [4]. Note that the constraints on  $D$  include a bound on the weighted  $\ell_1$ -norm  $\|v\|_{1,\infty}$  but no limits on  $|\text{spt}(v)|$ . As a result, the LSE is purely regularized by  $\ell_1$ -norms  $\|v\|_1$  and  $\|v\|_{1,\infty}$ .

Second,  $D = \mathcal{D}(I)$  and is compact, but not necessarily contained in a disc on which  $f$  is analytic. Again, the LSE is purely regularized by  $\ell_1$ -norms of  $v$ . However, it becomes harder to set  $c_1$ . A relatively simple choice of  $c_1$  is as follows. Let  $\varrho > 0$ , such that for any  $x \in I$ ,  $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - x| < \varrho\} \subset \mathcal{N}$ . Let  $d_k = \sup_{x \in I} |f^{(k)}(x)|/k!$ , and  $\delta(D)$  be the infimum of the radii of spheres under  $\|\cdot\|_{1,\infty}$  that contain  $D$ , i.e.,

$$\delta(D) = \inf\{a > 0 : \text{there is } u \in \mathbb{R}^p \text{ such that } \|v - u\|_{1,\infty} < a \text{ for all } v \in D\}.$$

Then, given  $\varrho_1 \in (0, \varrho)$ , we can set

$$c_1 = \sqrt{2}\sigma \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left[ k \sqrt{2p \ln(pQ) + k\lambda_p} d_k \varrho_1^{k-1} \times n^{-\frac{1}{2k}} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \|V_j\|_{2k} \right], \quad (3.1)$$

where  $Q = 4\delta(D)/\varrho_1 + 1$ . This value of  $c_1$  results from Proposition 5.5 (2) in [4] by noting the trivial bound  $|\text{spt}(v)| \leq p$ , which is nevertheless the tightest we can get, as no explicit constraints on  $|\text{spt}(v)|$  are available.

Unfortunately, if we use (3.1) to set  $c_1$ , then, in order for the error bound in Proposition 2.2 to be at most of order  $o(1)$ ,  $p$  cannot be very large. Indeed, as the error bound is proportional to  $c_1 \sqrt{|\text{spt}(\beta)|/n} \geq c \sqrt{|\text{spt}(\beta)| p \ln p/n}$  for some  $c > 0$ ,  $p$  has to be of order  $o(n/\ln n)$ .

### 3.3 Regression with noise-corrupted underlying linear structure

It is possible to generalize the treatment for analytic models to the following one

$$y = f(X_i^\top \beta + \xi) + \epsilon \quad (3.2)$$

where  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n, \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n$  are independent with mean 0, and  $\xi_i$ 's are identically distributed. The model reflects the point of view that noise can appear anywhere.

For nonlinear  $f$ , in general, if the common distribution of  $\xi_i$ 's is unknown, then  $\mathbb{E}(y_i)$  are unknown and regression becomes impossible. If, on the other hand, the distribution is known, then  $\mathbb{E}[f(z + \xi_i)]$  are known. Apparently, they are identical. Denote  $g(z) = \mathbb{E}[f(z + \xi_1)]$  and let  $\delta_i = f(X_i^\top \beta + \xi_i) - g(X_i^\top \beta) + \epsilon_i$ . Then

$$y = g(X^\top \beta) + \delta. \quad (3.3)$$

Note that, in general, the distributions of  $\delta_i$  depend  $X_i \beta$ . Since the latter are not identical,  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n$  are not identically distributed. Furthermore, since  $\beta$  is unknown, in general, even if the distributions of  $\epsilon_i$  are known, the distributions of  $\delta_i$  are still unknown. Despite this, by only using the fact that  $\delta_i$  are independent, each with mean 0, it is possible to apply the results in previous sections to (3.3), hence getting error bounds of estimation for (3.2).

To make this work, we need to check a few conditions, such as the analyticity of  $g(z)$  and the tail condition (2.3) for  $\delta$ . We next present a case where the necessary conditions are satisfied.

Suppose we set  $D = \mathcal{D}(I)$  with  $I = [-R, R]$ . Suppose  $\xi_i$  are bounded random variables with  $|\xi_i| < r$  and there is  $R_0 > R + r$ , such that  $f$  is continuous on  $\Delta_0 := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq R_0\}$  and analytic within it. Let  $\Delta = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < R_0 - r\}$ . For each  $z \in \Delta$ , by  $z + \xi_1 \in \Delta_0$ ,  $|f(z + \xi_1)| \leq \sup_{\Delta_0} |f| < \infty$ , so  $g(z) = \mathbb{E}[f(z + \xi_1)]$  is well defined. Clearly,  $I$  is contained within  $\Delta$ .

**Proposition 3.1** (1)  $g(z)$  is analytic on  $\Delta$  and  $\mathbf{d}(g, I) \geq \mathbf{d}(f, [-R_0, R_0])$ .

(2) If  $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n$  satisfy (2.3) for some  $\sigma > 0$  and  $c_\epsilon > 0$ , then  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n$  satisfy (2.3) as well for possibly different values of  $\sigma$  and  $c_\epsilon$ . Moreover, if  $\epsilon_i$  are bounded, then  $c_\epsilon$  can always be set at 2.

Thus, the results on  $\ell_1$ -regularized LSE in previous sections can be applied to (3.3). We omit the detail and will only prove the Proposition.

*Proof.* (1) Given  $z \in \Delta$ , for every possible value of  $\xi_1$ , we have  $f(z + \xi_1) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} f^{(k)}(\xi_1) z^k / k!$ . By Cauchy's contour integral,

$$\frac{|f^{(k)}(\xi_1)|}{k!} \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{|\zeta|=R_0} \frac{|f(\zeta)| d\zeta}{|\zeta - \xi_1|^{k+1}} \leq \frac{R_0 \sup_{\Delta_0} |f|}{(R_0 - r)^{k+1}}$$

Because  $R_0 - r > |z|$ ,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}|f^{(k)}(\xi_1)|}{k!} |z|^k \leq \frac{R_0 \sup_{\Delta_0} |f|}{R_0 - r} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{|z|}{R_0 - r} \right)^k < \infty.$$

Then by dominated convergence, it is seen that  $g(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[f^{(k)}(\xi_1)] z^k / k!$ , with the power series being convergent on  $\Delta$ . Therefore  $g(z)$  is analytic on  $\Delta$ .

To get  $\mathbf{d}(g, I) \geq \mathbf{d}(f, [-R_0, R_0])$ , let the right hand side be positive. Then  $f$  is monotone on  $[-R_0, R_0]$ , say, increasing. Then  $g(z) = \mathbb{E}[f(z + \xi_1)]$  is increasing on

$I$  and for  $x < y$ ,  $g(y) - g(x) = \mathbb{E}[f(y + \xi_1) - f(x + \xi_1)] \geq \mathbf{d}(f, [-R_0, R_0])(y - x)$ , finishing the proof of (1).

(2) Let  $\eta_i = f(X_i^\top \beta + \xi_i) - g(X_i^\top \beta)$ . Then  $\text{ess sup } \eta_i - \text{ess inf } \eta_i \leq 2 \sup_{\Delta_0} |f|$  and  $\delta_i = \eta_i + \epsilon_i$ . Given  $t \geq 0$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{|a^\top \delta| > t\|a\|_2\} &\leq \Pr\{|a^\top \eta| > t\|a\|_2/2\} + \Pr\{|a^\top \epsilon| > t\|a\|_2/2\} \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{t^2}{8 \sup_{\Delta_0} |f|^2} \right\} + c_\epsilon \exp \left\{ -\frac{t^2}{8\sigma^2} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to Hoeffding's inequality and the tail condition (2.3). This implies the first claim of (2). If  $\epsilon_i$  are bounded, then  $\delta_i$  are bounded, and the second claim follows from Hoeffding's inequality.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Bunea, F., Tsybakov, A., and Wegkamp, M. (2007). Sparsity oracle inequalities for the Lasso. *Electron. J. Stat.* **1**, 169–194 (electronic).
- [2] Candès, E. J. and Plan, Y. (2009). Near-ideal model selection by  $\ell_1$  minimization. *Ann. Statist.* **37**, 5A, 2145–2177.
- [3] Candès, E. J. and Tao, T. (2007). The Dantzig selector: statistical estimation when  $p$  is much larger than  $n$ . *Ann. Statist.* **35**, 6, 2313–2351.
- [4] Chi, Z. (2009).  $L_0$  regularized estimation for nonlinear models that have sparse underlying linear structures. Tech. Rep. 09-22, University of Connecticut, Department of Statistics. Available at <http://arXiv.org>.
- [5] Hristache, M., Juditsky, A., Polzehl, J., and Spokoiny, V. (2001). Structure adaptive approach for dimension reduction. *Ann. Statist.* **29**, 6, 1537–1566.
- [6] Hristache, M., Juditsky, A., and Spokoiny, V. (2001). Direct estimation of the index coefficient in a single-index model. *Ann. Statist.* **29**, 3, 595–623.
- [7] Pollard, D. (1984). *Convergence of stochastic processes*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- [8] Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol.* **58**, 1, 267–288.
- [9] Wasserman, L. and Roeder, K. (2009). High-dimensional variable selection. *Ann. Statist.* **37**, 5A, 2178–2201.
- [10] Zhang, T. (2009). Some sharp performance bounds for least squares regression with  $l_1$  regularization. *Ann. Statist.* **37**, 5A, 2109–2144.
- [11] Zhao, P. and Yu, B. (2006). On model selection consistency of Lasso. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **7**, 2541–2563.